

DAVID CHIU, State Bar #189542
City Attorney
YVONNE R. MERÉ, State Bar #173594
Chief Deputy City Attorney
TARA M. STEELEY, State Bar #231775
JOHN H. GEORGE, State Bar #292332
KAITLYN M. MURPHY, State Bar #293309
ABIGAIL H. WALD, State Bar #309110
Deputy City Attorneys
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682
Telephone: (415) 554-4655 (Steeley)
(415) 554-4223 (George)
(415) 554-6762 (Murphy)
(415) 554-3901 (Wald)
Facsimile: (415) 554-4699
E-Mail: tara.steeley@sfcityatty.org
john.george@sfcityatty.org
kaitlyn.murphy@sfcityatty.org
abigail.wald@sfcityatty.org

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE ROE, an individual; MARY ROE, an individual; SUSAN ROE, an individual; JOHN ROE, an individual; BARBARA ROE, an individual; PHOENIX HOTEL SF, LLC, a California limited liability company; FUNKY FUN, LLC, a California limited liability company; and 2930 EL CAMINO, LLC, a California limited liability company,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a California public entity,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-JST

**DECLARATION OF KAITLYN M. MURPHY
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR AN
ORDER ALLOWING DEFENDANT TO
EXCEED THE 25 PAGE LIMIT FOR THE
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Trial Date: August 10, 2026

1 I, KAITLYN MURPHY, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a Deputy City Attorney for Defendant City of San Francisco. I am a member in
3 good standing of the bar of this Court. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated, and if called
4 to testify, I can and will testify competently as to all matters set forth herein.

5 2. Plaintiffs' filed and served their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction on August 25,
6 2025. Defense counsel began working on a response to Plaintiffs' Motion with the expectation that the
7 page limit for the opposition brief would be 25 pages under the Northern District's Local Rules.

8 3. Defense counsel made a good faith effort to limit the length of the opposition brief to
9 25 pages, but have determined the City cannot adequately brief the Court on the issues raised within
10 the 25-page limit.

11 4. The City wrote to Plaintiffs' counsel on September 3, 2025, asking if Plaintiffs would
12 stipulate to a page extension that would permit the City seven additional pages for its opposition and
13 Plaintiffs five additional pages for their reply. Plaintiffs declined to stipulate and did not offer a
14 counter proposal.

15
16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true
17 and correct to the best of my knowledge. Executed September 9, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

18
19 /s/Kaitlyn M. Murphy

KAITLYN M. MURPHY